

Lingue e Linguaggi
 Lingue Linguaggi 26 (2018), 121-138
 ISSN 2239-0367, e-ISSN 2239-0359
 DOI 10.1285/i22390359v26p121
<http://siba-ese.unisalento.it>, © 2018 Università del Salento
 This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/)

METAPHORICAL EXPRESSIONS IN ALBANIAN AND SERBIAN ANCIENT LAW COLLECTIONS*

THOMAS CHRISTIANSEN,¹ MONICA GENESIN,²
 JOACHIM MATZINGER³

¹UNIVERSITÀ DEL SALENTO, ²UNIVERSITÀ DEL SALENTO,

³ÖSTERREICHISCHE AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN

Abstract –Based on cognitive linguistics, the authors decided to investigate a particular sort of literature, two Balkan collections of laws: the Albanian *Kanuni i Skënderbeut* and the Serbian *Zakonik Cara Stefana Dušana*. In these texts metaphors and metonymies are reflected in some expressions containing the body-part terms for ‘face’, ‘hand’, and ‘blood’, Alb. *faje*, Se. *lice*, Alb. *dorë*, Se. *ruka*, and Alb. *gjak*, Se. *krv*. Comparison of the Serb and Albanian texts and the occurrences of the cognates *gak* and *krv* (‘blood’), *faje* and *lice* (‘face’) and *dorë* and *ruka* (‘hand’) shows that, although differences occur, there are similarities.

Keywords: metaphors; Cognitive Linguistics; Balkan languages.

1. Introduction: key concepts behind metaphor, metonymy and embodiment

This article presents a semantic analysis of metaphors, metonymies and related expressions containing the lexical items denoting ‘face’, ‘hand’, and ‘blood’ in two Balkan ancient law collections: the Albanian *Kanuni i Lekë Dukagjinit* and the Serbian *Zakonik Cara Stefana Dušana*.

Before we show our analysis, a short discussion of some of the key concepts behind metaphor, metonymy and embodiment is in order. This theoretical background will also serve to highlight the complexity and topicality of metaphors and metonymy and show how even the analysis of them in ancient texts of lesser-studied languages may have broader significance to their wider study in other languages and contexts.

Since the 1980s, a considerable amount of research has taken as its focus the closely interrelated areas of embodiment, metonymy and metaphor.¹ At heart, that which links these notions is the way in which abstract, intangible concepts in the mind can be represented, by way of extension, by concrete, tangible concepts (and thus manifested as words denoting these same). The previous sentence started with the adverbial expression *at heart*, which is both a metaphor and a form of embodiment. Literally, the word *heart* denotes the vital organ responsible for, among other things, pumping blood around the body. Metaphorically, as an extension of the perceived properties of the physical heart as being the central motor² of the human body, the concept of ‘heart’ can be employed metaphorically also to mean the central

* Sections 1 and 5 by Thomas Christiansen, sections 2 and 3 by Monica Genesin, section 4 by Joachim Matzinger.

¹ See Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999), Lakoff and Núñez (2000), Panther and Radden (1999), Maalej and Yu (2011).

² As Lakoff and Johnson show, it is impossible not to use metaphors and they should not be seen merely as stylistic embellishment but are rather one of the basic mechanisms of language.

element of anything, even something abstract and thus constitutes the embodiment of something non-physical and without form to which it is impossible in a literal sense to attribute a centre at all.

Traditionally, concepts like metonymy and metaphor have been treated as highly complex stylistic devices employed successfully only by the greatest writers. Undoubtedly, such associations have led generations of ordinary people to see them as something formidable. Consequently, there is still much confusion about the difference between the various concepts.

The term *metonymy* is usually used to describe the process by which a word referring to part of something is used to refer to the whole,³ for example: “in my family, there are many mouths [people] to feed”. Within the general concept of metonymy, one can include *synecdoches*, where the whole (or larger element closely associated with the smaller element) stands for the smaller (e.g. “The university [the senate] voted to increase student fees”). On the cognitive level, metonyms function because the mind stores knowledge in so-called frame-based structures.⁴ This means that ideas are not activated in isolation from each other; each idea will inevitably be accompanied by a set of associated ideas whose relationships are established within the context of that particular frame, which of course, may differ from individual to individual (and be influenced also by the culture which that individual belongs to), but which are predictable insofar that, except in extreme cases, people tend to think in similar ways and have similar world-views.⁵

Metaphor entails transferring the attributes of one concept to another and metaphors have been traditionally contrasted with metonyms. The former, according to Jakobson (1956), are figures of similarity while metonyms are ones of contiguity. It is now argued within the field of cognitive linguistics that the two are not so easily separable. At a cognitive level, both metaphors and metonyms perform the function of allowing one to perceive one thing using the mental framework associated with something different and they thus provide useful (if sometimes unreliable) mental shortcuts to cope with new or abstract ideas by attaching to them the attributes of known ideas.⁶

According to Maalej and Yu (2011, p. 8), the relationship between metonymy and metaphor can be summed up in three key claims: first, metonymy is “a cognitive phenomenon more fundamental than metaphor”; second, “many metaphors are motivated conceptually by metonyms, which are more immediately grounded in experience”; third, “the boundary between metonymy and metaphor is fuzzy, i.e. they form a continuum”. Most importantly, Maalej and Yu (2011, p. 9) maintain that metonymy “often serves as a link between bodily experience and metaphor in the mapping process from concrete experience to abstract concepts”. According to Yu (2008), the cognitive structure of metaphors can be described by this simple diagram:

Bodily experience → metonymy → metaphor → abstract concepts.

³ With figurative devices in general, it is very difficult to find neat, precise definitions such as “part to whole”, which, as examples we discuss later will show, should not be taken too literally and rest often on a more general mental association between smaller and larger elements (e.g. “Town and Gown” to talk about the relationship between a university and its city, the gowns being something worn by academic staff but not physically part of them and therefore not literally part of the university). Indeed, if one looks too hard for them, one risks being led down many a philosophical or ontological “garden path”, to use yet another metaphor.

⁴ Barsalou (1992).

⁵ See Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999) on such universal metaphors as *up* being related to ‘more’ and *down* being associated with ‘fewer’ or ‘less’.

⁶ See Goossens (1999).

To Ziemke and Frank (2007, p.1), embodiment entails “the bodily and sensorimotor basis of phenomena such as meaning, mind, cognition and language”. The idea that the body influences the mind raises questions about so-called Cartesian dualism as, in effect, it assumes that the mind and the body are not a single indivisible element but recognizes them as two separate entities. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999) dismiss the Cartesian view and argue instead in favour of what they call *experientialism* whereby “experience is always an interactive process, involving neural and physiological constraints from the organism as well as characteristic affordances from the environment”.⁷

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999), metaphors exist on two main levels, the first of which is intrinsic to the mind and thus neural in nature. So fundamental is this first level that it determines how basic physical concepts are perceived and thus categorised in the first place. The second level, involves the extension of intuitive metaphors to other concepts. This, by contrast to the first level, is largely culturally determined.⁸

Study of embodiment shows that peoples’ experience and knowledge of their own bodies (the most immediate part of the environment with which the mind has contact) is used as the universal basis for the perception of the rest of the environment, including the more distant, less familiar and more abstract. From the earliest age, it is the human’s understanding of their own body that shapes their understanding of the wider world.

Kövecses (2010, p. 37) provides an insightful study into the nature of metaphor, and its relation to metonymy, distinguishing between three different kinds of metaphor, in order of specificity: *structural*, *ontological* and *orientational*.

In the first of these “the source domain provides a relatively rich knowledge structure for the target concept”. They are consequently the most complex and comprehensive and involve a mapping of a whole range of attributes from one concept to another, which creates a series of associations, made possible by shared knowledge of the source domain. Metaphors of this kind are widespread and fundamental to both the mind and language. As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) note, they constitute structured mappings giving the rationale behind many areas of language use dealing with some of the most fundamental concepts, among which: ‘ideas are food’, ‘argument is war’, ‘theories are buildings’, and ‘love is a journey’. Indeed, such metaphors govern our whole way of perceiving time in terms of motion and space and are thus encoded in the syntactic structure of language as well (Kövecses 2010, p. 37). The ontological is the second type of metaphor. It entails categorising an item by means of association with a relevant source concept, e.g. experiences as objects, substances or containers. This type of metaphor tends towards the subjective and is less structured. Its associations are more difficult to predict or objectively define, being, by their nature, only abstract, impressionistic links.

The final type of metaphors identified by Kövecses (2010) are orientational, so-called because they usually involve basic “human spatial orientations” (Kövecses 2010, p. 40). Of the three kinds, these are the least specific. They serve to establish some degree of coherence between separate target concepts within the cognitive system (Kövecses 2010, p. 39), for instance: *more* is ‘up’, *less* is ‘down’.

Kövecses (2010, p. 42) also contrasts the two different natures of metaphors: namely that they may have their foundations in either knowledge or images / schema. Knowledge is associated primarily with structural metaphors as it explains how a small number of relatively simple source concepts may generate a whole range of associations that constitute complex cognitive mapping. The other two types of metaphor are vaguer and less definite

⁷ Maalej and Yu (2011, p. 4).

⁸ Lakoff and Johnson (1980, pp. 256-257).

and so rely instead on images. These establish, in effect, isolated links of various indistinct kinds without the need for a complicated series of interconnected associations. It is here, perhaps, that metaphors and metonyms resemble each other most. Ontological and orientational metaphors function primarily on the level of simple pictures (e.g. “I’m fed up with your moaning”). With metonymy, images of individual parts come to represent the whole or vice versa (e.g. “The White House denied any wrongdoing”).

When it comes to examination of different languages, despite acknowledging that many universals must exist, it must be borne in mind that different languages and cultures may tend towards different conceptualisations. In this light, study of embodiment becomes especially interesting as a tool of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparison because the basic human body is common to all humankind, whatever a person’s language or culture, excepting the obvious gender differences and various superficial differences in skin, hair or eye colour or other physical features. Indeed, Kövecses (2010, pp. 18-23) places the *Human Body* at the top of the list of *Common Source Domains*, stating “The human body is an ideal source domain, since, for us, it is clearly delineated and (we believe) we know it well.” For Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999) too, the body provides many primary metaphors from which secondary metaphors may be derived. These typically manifest themselves as image schema, to cite Peña Cervel (2001, p. 247):

[...] the body and body parts in general constitute structures which are liable to be conceptualized by means of image-schemas. For instance, our bodies may be inside or outside a given container (e.g. *I was in love*). Additionally, as a structure which can be conceptualized our bodies or any body part can be seen as containers themselves (e.g. *I was full of joy*).

As we shall see in this study, metaphors from the source domain of the body may show differing degrees of generalisation and in addition may often turn out to be culture or context specific.

Kövecses (2010, pp. 44-45) recognises different levels of generality in metaphor. Specific-level metaphors involve schemata that are “filled in a detailed way” (Kövecses 2010, p. 45). Generic-level metaphors are, by contrast, “defined by only a small number of properties, which is to say that they are characterised by extremely skeletal structures” (Kövecses 2010, p. 45). In English, ‘heart’, for example, can be used as a source domain for a wide range of target domains that constitute both primary and secondary metaphors: the central physical part of something and, from this, the most important element or characteristic of something.

Finally, when it comes to generality, it can be quite difficult to characterise systematically the relationship between metaphors that relate to different body parts. In particular, image-schema are an area where different languages, as manifestations of different cultures, societies and world views, may differ greatly and sometimes be very difficult for outsiders to understand (think, for example, of the English expression *pulling someone’s leg* to mean trying to make a fool of someone).

2. The Text Corpus: the *Kanuni i Skënderbeut* and the *Zakonik Cara Stefana Dušana*

Based on cognitive linguistics, the following study focuses on how metaphor and metonymy are reflected in Albanian and Serbian expressions containing the body-part terms for ‘face’ Alb. *faje*, Se. *lice*, ‘hand’ Alb. *dorë*, Se. *ruka*, and ‘blood’ Alb. *gjak*, Se. *krv*. In doing so, the authors decided to investigate a particular sort of literature, two Balkan collections of

laws: the Albanian *Kanuni i Skënderbeut* and the Serbian *Zakonik Cara Stefana Dušana*. The first is a set of customary laws and prescriptions from the central part of Northern Albania (Kurbini, Malësia and Dibrës), originally handed down orally, which was finally published by Dom Frano Ilia only in 1993. As parallels from other customary law collections reveal, the clerics who collected this genre of prescriptions undertook a huge amount of intervention into the texts, particularly as concerns the normalization of the language. However, this intervention did not affect the rich uses of metaphorical and metonymic expressions.

Dušan's Code (*Душанов законик*, *Dušanov zakonik*) is a compilation of several legal systems that was undertaken by Stefan Uroš IV Dušan of Serbia in 1349. It was used in the Serbian Empire and the succeeding Serbian Despotate. It is considered an early constitution, or at least close to it; an advanced set of laws which regulated all aspects of life. The Code was promulgated at a state council on 21 May 1349 in Skopje, at that time the capital of the Serbian Empire. Dušan's Code was heavily influenced by Byzantine law – nearly half of its articles reflect some influence, often modified for Serbian needs.⁹

3. The Text Analysis: the *Kanuni i Skënderbeut*

The semantic analysis of metonymies, metaphors and related expressions involving body-part terms starts with 'face' Alb. *faqe* in the *Kanuni i Skënderbeut*. The concept of 'face' plays an important role in Albanian culture. The face is one of the most important parts of our body, as it is "the focus of human interaction" and "the most important identity mark of who we are, both physically and socially" Fine (1994, p. 314), and as such provides access to metaphors and metaphorical interpretation of abstract concepts such as emotion, character, prestige, dignity.¹⁰ The metaphors and the metaphorical expressions found in the corpus regard some perceived roles of faces, namely 1. "highlight of appearance and look" Yu (2001, p. 2f.), "focus of interaction and relationship", "locus for dignity and prestige".

In the following examples, the word *faqe* is used in prepositional phrases with an orientational sense:

Art. VI n. 1480: *I cili [...] do të paguej faqe dy shokve të marrsit*
 "Who... is going to pay in front of two friends of the debtor"

Art. VI n. 2725: *Berrejshimi [...] duhet të shkoje në kishë një ditë moti dhe faqe popullit do të vuej një pendesë*
 "The perjury [...] will have to go to church one day and will make penance before the people"

In the examples below the "face-for-person metonymy" (Christiansen *et al.* 2015, pp. 317-318) is extended to objects and abstract things via metaphor, a development which is not unknown to other body-part terms¹¹ like *krye* 'head' or *sy* 'eye'.

The face has also a social role in interpersonal interaction since it is the most distinctive body part. The role of face as "focus of interaction" Yu (2001, p. 2f.) can be seen in the following metonymic extension *dal faqe* lit. 'to exit by face' → 'to present oneself, to turn out one's face'.

Art. VI n. 2669: *Kapucari zakonisht nuk del faqe as nuk mund të detyrohet të dali faqe*
 "The traitor usually does not show itself openly or can not be forced to do so"

⁹ Fine (1994, p. 314).

¹⁰ Christiansen *et al.* (2015, pp. 317-318).

¹¹ Christiansen *et al.* (2015, pp. 317-318).

The face is also conceptualized as “locus of dignity and prestige” Yu (2001, p. 2f.) by metaphorical and metonymical projection. As is shown in the following examples, the phrase *faqe e zezë* ‘dishonor, dishonorable act’ refers to the act of damaging dignity when the face is ‘black’ (*e zezë*), an adjective which is often associated with negative qualities:

Art. VI n. 1510: *Hangre fjalën, çove faqen e zezë ke shtëpia*
 “If you have not kept the word (literally “you ate the word”) you brought dishonor to the family”

Art. VI n. 3004: *Kush vret baben e vet [...] në gjak nuk bie, por në faqe të zezë*
 “He who kills his father does not fall into the blood, but into dishonor”

This is in sharp contrast to the use of the adjective *i, e bardhë* ‘white’ in the following examples which emphasizes the relation between face and dignity, i.e. the sense of honour:

Art. VI n. 3354: *Pushka për nderë të zbardh faqen, megjithse në gjak të lëshon.*
 “The gun for honors may honor you (lit. “whiten your face”) even if it puts you in the blood”

Art. VI n. 3417: *Shpifja me dam në nderë ka faqen e zezë para shoqnisë*
 “The slander that damages honor brings disgrace (lit. “has a black face”) in front of his companions”

The following example:

Art. VI n. 595: *Kafen e pjekë i zoti i shtëpisë ... Kafija e zezë, ka faqen e bardhë*
 “Black coffee honors you (lit. “has the white face”)

reveals an interesting expression structured by metonymy and metaphor. The word *faqe* ‘face’ in collocation with the adjective *e bardhë* ‘white’ has developed an idiomatic, but also motivated, meaning of ‘honour, honorable act’. The head of the sentence *kafija e zezë* ‘black coffee’¹² can be regarded as a type of metonymy. It expresses via personification the abstract concept of hospitality, as black coffee is commonly offered as a sign of hospitality in Albanian and in other Balkan Mediterranean countries.

In the examples below the “face-for-person metonymy” (Christiansen *et al.* 2015, p. 317-18) is extended to objects and abstract things via metaphor, a development which is not unknown to other body-part terms¹³ like *krye* ‘head’ or *sy* ‘eye’.

Let us continue with another conceptual domain, the human hand. The hands are one of the most important external body parts with which humans deal with the external world and “establish the cognitive schemas upon which we build more abstract and complex concepts” Yu (2003, pp. 337-338). Therefore the word *hand* is perhaps the most frequently used body-part term. The process of metaphoric and metonymic embodiment is seen in the following examples expressing control by holding something/somebody in the hand:

Art. VI n. 577: *Miku [...] asht në dorë të shtëpisë për çdo rrezik*
 “The host is under the protection of the family (lit. “in the hand”) for any risk and danger”

Art. VI n. 1654: *[gjâ] damtohet në dorë të tjereve*
 “The livestock is damaged while in other’s hands”

Art. VI n. 3458: *Me i ra n’dorë cubi meshtarit*

¹² The category of ‘food’ is a relatively common source domain in metaphorically understanding abstract targets, cf. Kövecses (2010, pp. 20-21).

¹³ Christiansen *et al.* (2015, pp. 317-318).

“If the brigand puts himself under (lit. “falls into the hands”) the protection of the priest”

These examples rely on the metonymy: ‘the hand stands for control’. But control is also understood metaphorically via the conceptual metaphor ‘*the hand is control*’, Christiansen *et al.* (2015, p. 317-18).

The metaphor ‘*holding in the hand is possession*’ underlies the following examples:

Art. VI n. 3250: *Kush ven dorë në gjaë të huej*
“Who puts his hand on the other’s cattle”

Art. VI n. 2526: *Kush ka mall te huejn në dorë*
“Who owns (lit. “has in the hands”) the things of others”

Art. VI n. 498: *Ai qe [...] merr menjihet në dore, si të veten, pasunin e tundshme e të patundshme*
“Who immediately disposes (lit. “takes in the hands”) of movable and immovable property”

Another metaphor of the type ‘*holding in the hand is attention*’ underlies the following examples:

Art. VI n. 2395: *Të cilve u lëshohet në dorë ajo çështje*
“That matter will be left (in the hands) to them”

Art. VI n. 1398: *Çdo ngatrrësë a mosmarrveshje [...] do ta marrin neper dorë të gjithë pjeshtarët e ndamjes*
“Any dispute or disagreement will be dealt with (will be handled) by all the participants in the division”

Art. VI n. 1830: *Atë punë e ka në dorë voglia*
“The people have that question in their hands”

Art. VI n. 2258: *Asht në dorë të katundit e bajrakut me e lane a m’e qitë*
“It is up to the village and the flag (lit. “it’s in the village and flag’s hands”) to decide whether to let them stay”

The motivation for this special meaning is that something in our hand usually awakes our interest.

In the corpus some other metaphorical uses of ‘*hand*’ denote activities:¹⁴

Art. VI n. 445: *Po hoq dore dhandrri prej grues s’ikun*
“If the groom gives up (lit. “takes his hands off”) the bride who has fled”

Art. VI n. 3126: *Në këtë rast duket të ndërhyrje katundi [...] tue i lane dorë të lire shtëpisë së vramit*
“In this case the village must intervene [...] giving (lit. “leaving”) a free hand to the family of the murdered”

Art. VI n. 2243: *nuk ia njet kush doren*
“Nobody gives him a hand (lit. “shakes his hands)”

Art. VI n. 1774: *Mashkuj të dobët [...] lehen mbas dore prej popullit*
“Weak males are neglected (lit. “are left behind the hands”) by the people”

The use of ‘*hand*’ in the above-mentioned examples may best be derived from certain conventionalized gestures involving the human hands.

¹⁴ Kőveccs and Szabó (1996, pp. 337f.).

Finally, ‘*hand*’ refers to a kind, a type or variety of something (cf. the uses of *ruka* in section 4.):

Art. VI n. 1312: *këso dore ndahen edhe çmimet staneve*
 “In this way the prices of the huts are defined”

Here below, hand is mapped onto the target domain “thing, type”:

Art. VI n. 1120: *Udha e verbtë asht ajo qe nuk vazhdon veçse deri në një vend të caktuem dhe zakonisht asht udhë arnajsh, kopshtiesh etj. Këso dore.*
 “It is called a blind road that road that ends up in a certain place and is usually the road of fields, garden, and the like”.

It turns out that the body fluid *gjak* ‘blood’ is very productive in the conceptualization of cultural values and abstract terms.¹⁵ Blood, as a vital fluid, has an abundant symbolism in many cultures and represent passion, family ties, life, violence, and death. The examination of the occurrences of ‘*blood*’ has led to the identification of two major metaphorical target themes which are rooted in common bodily experience and in conventional knowledge: institutionalized violence (feud, murder); and biological relationship (patrilineal descent). The last category suggests that a person or a group carries things in the blood, by originating from a certain group. A well known semantic extension can be seen in the use of *gjak* to express the blood-feud, the custom of institutionalized vengeance with which Albania and the Albanians are frequently associated, most often due to a misinterpretation of this complex practice. In addition to “blood-feud”, “vengeance”, other metonymical and metaphorical expressions appear like “reconciliation”, “common origin”, “descent”, and “patrilineal descent”. The semantic extension of blood to “murder” is found also in other languages, e.g. Italian, and is construed by a metaphor based on some kind of experiential correlation. The metaphorical link between “blood” and “murder” is not accidental or arbitrary but rooted in common bodily experience.

Art. VI n. 1887: *Gruaja [...] nuk bje më gjak, nuk kërkohet per gjak*
 “The woman doesn’t incur blood [i.e. is not subject to the blood feud]”

Art. VI n. 3512: *Me i vra kend rrogatari i kishëse çon gjakun në shtëpi të vet*
 “If a church employee kills someone, they take the blood in their house”

Art. VI n. 2857: *Gjaku shkon per gisht.*
 “Blood follows the finger (i.e. the person who commits a murder incurs a blood feud)”

Art. VI n. 50: *Fis a gjak janë të gjith ata qe rrjedhin nga një babë i perbashkët*
 “Fis or gjak are all those who descend from a common ancestor”

Art. VI n. 835: *Trashigimi mbrenda gjakut ndjek barkun*
 “Inheritance within the blood follows the belly”

Art. VI n. 3477: *Meshtari nuk mund të ndjekë kend per gjak të prindës*
 “The priest can not pursue anyone for the killing of the parent”

Art. VI n. 441: *Gjaqet ndjekin kanunet e veta*
 “The murders are governed (lit. “follow”) by the specific rules of the Kanuni”

¹⁵ See Christiansen (2013, p. 162f.).

4. The Text Analysis: the *Zakonik Cara Stefana Dušana*

In addition to the attestations of the Albanian corpus we may now add the metaphorical uses of the regarding body parts in the Serbian law code of Tsar Stefan Dušan (in Serbian terms known as the *zakonik cara Stefana Dušana*):¹⁶ *krv* ‘blood’, *lice* ‘face’, and *ruka* ‘hand’.

The first item *krv* ‘blood’, like Albanian *gjak*, denotes in a metaphoric use the act of a homicide. It may it be intended or not, thus ‘bloodshed’.¹⁷ It is attested in the sections 103, 183, and 192 of the Prizren manuscript of the *zakonik*,¹⁸ cf. e.g. the enactment of section 103 (Figure 1) regarding the trial of slaves:¹⁹

**103. Призренски. Яште соу отроци, да се соуде
прѣдъ своимъ господарин како люѣ за свое дѣловѣ; а
за царевѣ да гредоуть прѣдъ соудіе, за крѣвѣ, за вра-
ждоу, за тати, за гоу сарѣ, за прѣмѣ людскыи.**

Figure 1

The *zakonik*, Prizren manuscript, section 103.

Burr (1949-50, p. 516) gives the following translation: “In the case of slaves, they shall be tried before their own lords for all their own affairs, but for crimes they shall go before the judges, that is for *bloodshed*, murders,²⁰ theft, brigandage and harbouring men”.²¹

The second item *lice* ‘face’ in addition to its primary semantic function of denoting the front side of the head, is also a legal term used to designate “property, possession; corpus

¹⁶ On the Serbian law code in general see e.g. Angelini (2012), and especially Angelini (2014). Our research was based on the following critical editions: Novaković (1898), Radojčić (1960), and Begović (1975).

¹⁷ For the lexical meaning see e.g. Daničić (1863a, p. 498), Miklosich (1888, p. 138), and Karadžić (1935, p. 310). For the legal aspect of *krv* in the context of the Serbian law, especially the *zakonik* see e.g. Novaković (1898, p. 208f.), Radojčić (1960, p. 138), Solovjev (1980, p. 261f.), and Marković (1999).

¹⁸ According to the numbering by Novaković 1898 (of the Prizren manuscript) followed by Radojčić (1960). For a concordance of the 1975 Academy edition (Athos and Struga manuscripts), see Begović (1975, p. 253f.).

¹⁹ The transliterations of the *zakonik* are taken from the Novaković edition of 1898, section 103 is to be found on p. 79, cf. also Radojčić (1960, p. 62).

²⁰ The Serbian term *vražda* has a twofold meaning, it not only denotes the killing of a person, especially under the conditions of a blood feud (*vendetta*), but it also denotes the mulct for this very criminal act, i.e. the *weregeld* that has to be paid in compensation, cf. the following two selected attestations (1) from the statutes of Budva from the mid-15th century (see Schmitt 2002, p. 29 on its dating), there in Chap. 191 *Ordinemo, che se alcun homo facesse vendetta o vurasda, et havesse moglie, non si possa levar cosa nissuna della sua moglie per la vendetta* (the text is given after Novaković 1912, p. 66), (2) in a letter of King Stefan Uroš II Milutin to the merchants of Dubrovnik from 1302 ...*да плати господарь враждоу*... “so shall the owner pay the mulct” (see Novaković 1912, p. 162; a perfectly readable facsimile plus description is available at the following link:

http://monasterium.net/mom/SerbianRoyalDocumentsDubrovnik/13020914_%E2%80%93_Milutin_A/cha_rter. On the institution of the *vražda* see also e.g. Daničić (1863a, p. 154), Radojčić (1960, p. 94), Mihaljčić (1999), Angelini (2014, p. 90f.).

²¹ The edition of Begović (1975, p. 334) gives the following French translation by Jeanne Milovanović based on this section as attested in the Athos manuscript (*atonski rukopis*): “S’il s’agit de serfs que leurs délits soient jugés devant leurs maîtres à leur gré, pour les délits qui les concernent: mais pour ceux qui concernent l’Empereur qu’ils comparaissent devant les juges pour meurtre, vengeance, vol, brigandage ou recel d’autrui”.

delicti”²² that is attested in the sections 92, 149, and 180 of the Prizren manuscript of the *zakonik*, cf. e.g. section 92 (Figure 2):

**92. Призренски. Ако кто позна лице подъ човекомъ,
а воудѣ оу горѣ оу поуестошин; да га повѣде оу прѣ-
прѣвниѣ село, и зарочѣи селоу и позовеѣ, да га дадеѣ
прѣдъ соудѣи; ако ли не да село прѣдъ соудѣи;
што покаже соудѣ, да платѣи село то-ѣи.**

Figure 2

The *zakonik*, Prizren manuscript, section 92.

It is generally assumed that in this section the term *lice* “property; corpus delicti” refers to a horse, therefore Burr (1949-50, p. 215) gives the following translation:

If any man recognise his own horse under another man and it be in the mountains or in the wilderness, let him take him to the nearest village and hand him to the village and call upon it to deliver him to the tribunal: and if the village do not deliver him to the tribunal, let that village pay so much as the tribunal shall direct.²³

On the other hand, a more general use of the term *lice* in the sense of a stolen thing, of someone’s stolen property, i.e. the corpus delicti, is encountered e.g. in section 149 (Figure 3) that states:

**149. Призренски. Оимъ-ѣи образомъ да се каже гоу-
саръ и татъ обавиши; и тако-ѣи [вѣ] обавиѣи, ако се
што годѣ лицемъ оухвати оу нѣхъ, или ако [нѣхъ]
оухвате оу гоуѣи или оу краѣи, или нѣхъ *прѣдалоу*
жоупѣ, или селоу или господаремъ, или властѣиоу кон-
ѣ надъ нѣмъ, како ѣсть выше оуписано, ты-ѣи гоусарѣ
и татѣ да се не помиоуѣи; [нѣ] да се ослепе и оѣѣсе.**

Figure 3

The *zakonik*, Prizren manuscript, section 149.

And in this manner shall a brigand or thief be punished, who is taken in the act. He is deemed guilty if there be found on him a stolen thing, or if he be taken in the act of robbing or thieving, or when they are handed to the county or to the village, or to the headmen or to the lord who is over them, as written above. And these brigands and thieves shall not be pardoned but blinded and hanged (translation of Burr 1949-50, p. 527).²⁴

²² See Daničić (1863b, p. 16), Novaković (1898, p. 201f.), Taranovski (1935, p. 192f.), Radojčić (1960, p. 115), Solovjev (1980, p. 296), Angelini (2014, p. 101).

²³ The French translation of this section of the Athos manuscript in Begović (1975, p. 237) (by Jeanne Milovanović) reads as follows: “*Si quelqu’un reconnaît un objet volé détenu par autrui, que ce soit en montagne ou en un endroit désert, que celui-là au bourg le plus proche pour le livrer aux autorités du village, mais qu’il leur demande de le citer en justice. Si les autorités ne procèdent pas comme demandé, que le village paie le prix établi par le tribunal*”.

²⁴ The French translation of the Athos manuscript by Jeanne Milovanović given in Begović (1975, p. 244) does not translate *lice* in a specific way and renders this section as: “*Ainsi que soit puni voleur ou brigand pris sur le fait. Et ils seront considérés comme tels s’ils sont pris en flagrant délit, directement sur le fait*;

It is possible that this peculiar semantic reflects the very frequent metonymy of the type ‘The face stands for the person’. In this case the face-for-person metonymy is extended to objects via personification (see 3. The Text Analysis: the *Kanuni i Skënderbeut*).

In the *zakonik* of Tsar Dušan, the third item *ruka* very often occurs in its primary semantic function to denote the respective body part. Most of these cases are to be found in the sections of the criminal law that foresees the cutting off of the hand or hands of the perpetrator for a given crime,²⁵ cf. e.g. Section 53 of sexual violence (rape) against a noblewoman (Figure 4):

53. Призренски. И кон властѣаник оузме владикуу по снаѣ, да моу се овѣ роуке о҃гѣкоу, и носѣ оу҃реже; ако ли севрѣк оузме по снаѣ владикуу, да се овѣки; ако ли свою дру҃гоу оузавѣ по снаѣ, да моу се овѣ роуке о҃гѣкоу, и носѣ оу҃реже.

Figure 4

The *zakonik*, Prizren manuscript, section 53.

Burr (1949-50, p. 208): “And if any lord take a noblewoman by force, let both his hands be cut off and his nose be slit. But if a commoner²⁶ take a noblewoman by force, let him be hanged. And if he take his own equal by force, let both his hands be cut off and his nose slit”.

Aside from its regular use to denote the physical body part ‘hand’, *ruka* displays also some metaphorical uses²⁷ which are attested in the *zakonik*. The first one of these metaphorical uses is to be found in the application of *ruka* as a special law term to denote a certain form of immunity given to the defendant by the church or by some noblemen to protect him from trial.²⁸ Section 84 of the *zakonik* (Figure 5) is a firm declaration that this *ruka* will not be in accepted in court, i.e. the law applies to all:

ou il s'ils sont surpris effectuant brigandage ou vol, ou s'ils sont livrés soit par la joupā, le village, le vassal ou le seigneur qui sont à la tête de la circonscription; comme il est dit ci-dessus, que ces bandits ne soient pas graciés, mais aveuglés ou pendus”.

²⁵ The cutting off of the hand or hands is – as is also the slitting of the nose – a punishment that comes from the Byzantine criminal law (on the punishment of *χειροκοπεῖν* in the context of the various Byzantine law collections see e.g. Patlagean 1984) and constitutes thus one of the many Byzantine components of the Old Serbian *zakonik* (on this issue see e.g. Solovjev 1959, p. 443f.; Angelini 2011; Angelini 2014, p. 113; Angelini 2015, p. 429f.; on the cutting off of the hand or hands as required punishment in the various sections of the *zakonik* see e.g. Angelini 2011, p. 250). Regarding the crime of rape among South Slavs (also in the context of their laws) see Levin (1989, p. 215f.).

²⁶ The Serbian text reads the term *sebar* (on this term see e.g. Šarkić 2010, p. 204; Angelini 2014, p. 99).

²⁷ For some metonymic uses of Modern Serbian *ruka* in comparison with English, see Silaški and Radić-Bojanić (2014).

²⁸ See e.g. Daničić (1864, p. 61) (“*tutela; vadimonium, quodque pro eo permissio praestabatur iudici*”), Novaković (1898, p. 196f.), Taranovski (1935, p. 185f.), Radojčić (1960, p. 113), Solovjev (1980, p. 245), Šarkić (1999), and Šarkić (2010, p. 206f. referring also to the older occurrences of this term in the Serbian documents). In later times, the protection of the *ruka* took on a rather negative connotation (see Šarkić 1999; Šarkić 2010, p. 206) as it also became the expression for the sum of money paid as fine or court fees (see Solovjev 1980, p. 245; Šarkić 2010, p. 206f.).

84. Призренски. Соуд'ви [да] не за котль; ни оправѣ никак'вѣ; кто се оправн, да не дава соудамъ оправѣ; роукѣ на соудѣ да нѣсть, и опаданіа и оудавѣ; тѣмю да се соудѣ по закону.

Figure 5

The *zakonik*, Prizren manuscript, section 84.

Burr (1949-50, p. 214): “After ordeal there shall be no further trial. Who so proves his innocence shall give no further proof to the courts, nor shall he pay costs. There shall be neither surety in court nor false accusation nor imprisonment for debt, but let every man be tried according to law”.²⁹

The second metaphoric use of *ruka* ‘hand’ in the *zakonik* is attested in section 119 (Figure 6) of the Prizren manuscript which is dedicated to the merchants:

119. Призренски. Окрьлата и малѣ и велике роукѣ потребна тръгов'ци да гредоу свободно ве-забавѣ по земли царства ми, да продаю и коупоую и тргоую како комуоу тръгъ доноси.

Figure 6

The *zakonik*, Prizren manuscript, section 119.

The translation of Burr (1949-50, p. 520) (“Merchants who trade in scarlet cloth of better or inferior quality shall travel freely without hindrance in my dominion and sell and buy and trade however commerce may require”) however does not pay justice to the true meaning of *ruka* in this very context. The clue to its correct interpretation can only be detected by looking outside the Prizren manuscript, e.g. by comparing this section e.g. in the Athos manuscript (Figure 7):³⁰

Окрьлата. и малѣ и велике коуплѣ потреб'нѣ. тръговци да гредѣ безъ забавѣ по земли царевѣ. да продаю и коупоую. како мѣ тръгъ доноси.

Figure 7

The *zakonik*, Athos manuscript, section 119.

Here the expression *i male i velike kuplje* “of the small and the big goods”, resp. “of the small and the big purchase” is much more obvious and pushes the understanding of the use of *ruka* in the Prizren manuscript which simply meant “kind, method, way”, or as already

²⁹ In the French translation of this section of the Athos manuscript in Begović (1975, p. 236 by Jeanne Milovanović) one can read: “Pour celui qui a retiré sa main intacte de la chaudière, il n’y a plus ni jugement ni justification aucune. Que celui qui sort intact de l’ordalie n’ait pas à répondre devant les juges. Qu’au tribunal il n’existe pas de partialité, de diffamation ni de contrainte. Que justice soit faite uniquement selon la loi”.

³⁰ The following transliteration has been taken from Begović (1975, p. 190, the French translation of this section of the Athos manuscript in Begović (1975, p. 240) by Jeanne Milovanović is rather vague): “Les commerçants qui font trafic de la pourpre et de denrées, petites et grandes, peuvent circuler sur nos terres impériales sans être arrêtés, qu’ils vendent et achètent selon le marché”.

Novaković (1898, p. 218) has put it in Serbian, “врсѣта”.³¹ Therefore, the expression *i malje i velike ruke* in the Prizren manuscript is to be understood as “of the small and the big kind” which in the context of the trading of scarlet cloth can then be more precisely interpreted as the trade of “small and big goods” or as Šarkić (2010, p. 205) has put it: “Großhandel” and “Einzelhandel” (i.e. ‘wholesale’ and ‘retail’).³²

The same metaphorical use of *ruka* ‘hand’ to denote ‘kind, method, way’ is also attested with the Albanian equivalent *dorë* as was shown in the examples of the *Kanuni* in section 3. However, this metaphorical use is not only restricted to the customary law collections but is indeed already attested in the oldest Albanian documents,³³ cf. the following selected examples:

Buzuku 1555: fol. 89.44, Mark 9.28: *këjo dorë ën dreqënish as për ëndonjë kafshë nukë mundë dalënë më së pr'oratë e për ëngjënimt*³⁴

“this kind of demons can be driven out in no other way than by praying and fasting”³⁵

Budi 1621: *Speculum Confessionis* 2.20: *Prāshtu aty gjithëkush duhetë me thanë mirëfilli të dërejtënë, se qish dorë gruoje qe ajo, me ka e bani mpkatnë*³⁶

“Therefore, everyone must there quite clearly say the truth, what kind of woman it was, with whom he sinned”

da Lecce 1702, *Dittionario Italiano-Albanese*³⁷ fol. 170r.8100: *nazione; paese dhë, u, ut; dorë, a, së*, fol. 203r.9724: *qualità; conditione di cose dorë, a, së*, fol. 222r.10661: *schiatte; razza dorë, a; farë, a; fis, i*, fol. 234v.11276: *sorte; conditione dorë, a, së*, fol. 242r.11655: *stirpe fis, i, it, farë, a; dorë, a, së*

Thus, regarding this metaphorical use of ‘hand’, Albanian and Serbian coincide. However, the simple fact that the metaphor ‘kind, method, way’ deduced from both Albanian *dorë* and Serbian *ruka* is met with this or very similar meanings also in other languages (cf. Old northern Italian,³⁸ e.g. Old Lombard *d’omiunca man* ‘every kind of’,³⁹ German *allerhand* ‘all kinds of’,⁴⁰ French *manière* way, ‘manner from’ **manuāria*,⁴¹ a derivation of *manus*, as well as Rumanian *mână* ‘categorie, treaptă, rang, clasă, calitate’,⁴² Bulgarian *ръка* ‘social rank, position’,⁴³ and Macedonian *raka* ‘phase, stage’)⁴⁴ is maybe a reasonable indication

³¹ See also Karadžić (1935, p. 676) (“од сваке руке *allerhand*, varie”), and Skok (1973, p. 168).

³² Also Solovjev (1980, p. 275) (“... тј. трговине на велико и на мало”).

³³ See also the notes in Çabej (1987, p. 289).

³⁴ See Ressuli (1958, p. 292).

³⁵ Cf. the Latin version *hoc genus in nullo potest exire nisi in oratione et ieiunio* (see Weber and Gryson 1994, p. 1590).

³⁶ See Svane (1986, p. 2).

³⁷ Unpublished manuscript, see the edition by Gurga (2009) (for the various attestations of *dorë* see the index on pp. 661f.).

³⁸ See Pușcariu (1905, p. 93).

³⁹ *Arbori et fruite d’omiunca man* ‘trees and fruits of every kind’ in the 13th century sermon of Pietro da Barsegapé (see Salvioni 1891, p. 433).

⁴⁰ See e.g. Grimm and Grimm (1984, p. 362).

⁴¹ See Wartburg (1969, p. 280f.).

⁴² See e.g. the online edition of the *Dicționar explicativ al limbii române* (DEX Online: dexonline.ro, *sub voce*).

⁴³ See e.g. Racheva and Todorov (2002, p. 367).

⁴⁴ See e.g. Koneski (2011, p. 79).

that it had developed independently in Albanian and Serbian and is therefore not to be considered as a result of language contact.⁴⁵

5. Conclusions

In this article, we have carried out a semantic analysis of metaphors, metonymies and related expressions containing the lexical items denoting ‘face’, ‘hand’, and blood in two Balkan ancient law collections: the Albanian *Kanuni i Lekë Dukagjinit* and the Serbian *Zakonik Cara Stefana Dušana*. As explained in the introduction, metonymy metaphor, and embodiment are closely inter-connected areas which individually and collectively are the subject of much ongoing research that serve to show how central they all are to both language and culture.

Historical varieties of Balkan languages offer an interesting avenue for research into this area. In Christiansen *et al.* (2015) the importance of a Balkan language like Albanian was highlighted in respect to this research area. In this chapter, we have explored this area further adding a Serbian dimension, which is another language from the adjacent, sometimes overlapping, region but with very different historical roots, it being a South Slavic while Albanian constitutes an independent branch of the Indo-European languages.

Comparison of the Serb and Albanian corpora and the occurrences of the cognates *gjak* and *krv* (‘blood’), *faje* and *lice* (‘face’) and *dorë* and *ruka* (‘hand’) shows that, although differences occur, there are similarities. For example, in both sets of texts, the concept of ‘blood’ is equated metaphorically with physical violence and loss of life. On the other hand, differences do emerge; in the Serbian texts the word *lice* (‘face’) unlike its Albanian counterpart *faje*, functions as a legal term to denote property as well as more generally stolen property. In the Albanian texts, the word *dorë* (‘hand’) is often used to denote control, while in the Serbian, its counterpart, *ruka* is used to denote the means by which something is done. At a deeper level, the concepts of control and method can be seen as related and indeed the same metaphorical use is found in other European languages such as French and German. It would be interesting to examine further how and why different languages come to resemble each other or not in matters of metaphor, metonymy or embodiment.

Obviously, as we set out in the introduction, some aspects of these areas are universal and form the basic human conceptualization of the world. Others, however, may have evolved over time and reflect the specific cultural and historical landscape of the peoples using a given language. This is what makes studies of Balkan languages so interesting in this respect as this area of Europe is synonymous with ethnic, cultural and religious diversity, and of course, most notoriously, conflict. Languages like Albanian and Serbian (to name just two in this richly diverse area) have evolved alongside each other over centuries in communities that have coinhabited, and often contested, the same living space and territory. Understanding how the conceptual systems underlying such languages evolve both together and separately allows an insight into the ways that both languages and mindsets converge and diverge and allows further study into the linguistic and cognitive effects of such phenomena.

⁴⁵ In fact it would be hard to decide whether Albanian would have loaned from Serbian or vice versa —let alone the role of Rumanian and the other South Slavic idioms – taking into consideration that the literary documentation of Albanian only starts in the mid-16th century (whereas e.g. Serbian *ruka* in its metaphorical uses is already attested in the older Serbian documents, see Taranovski (1935, p. 185f.), and ŠarkiĆ (2010, p. 206f.).

Bionote: Thomas Christiansen is an associate professor in English Language and Translation at the Università del Salento (Lecce, Italy) and Director of the University Language Centre. He has taught in various positions at various universities in Apulia (Italy), the UK, and Poland. He completed his PhD in textual linguistics at Salford (UK). He has researched into various areas of linguistics including systemic linguistics and functional grammar, varieties of English, ELF, teaching English, language testing, and analysis of different corpora, including spoken discourse. He has also worked as an expert consultant for Cambridge Assessment English for many years

Monica Genesin is an associate professor in "Albanian Language " at Department of Humanities, Università del Salento. Her research interests focus on diachronic and synchronic Albanian linguistics, Balkan languages and cultures. She is also in the editorial board of `various scientific journals. Since 2007 member of the supervisory board of the II level Master on "Interlingual, intercultural mediation in immigration and asylum affairs", in 2007-2008 responsible of the project Promoalba, financed through the EU programme Italia – Albania, in 2010 leading role in the activities of the University of Calabria organizing the Summer School for Balkan languages and Cultures.

Joachim Matzinger is a scientific employee at the Research Unit Balkan Studies of the Institute for Modern and Contemporary Historical Research INZ at the Austrian Academy of Sciences. His research interests focus on diachronic and synchronic Albanian linguistics, Balkan languages and cultures. He has taught at various universities in Austria and Germany. He completed his PhD in 2001 in historical linguistics in Jena (Germany). He is in the editorial board of the scientific journal PALAVER.

Authors' addresses:

monica.genesin@unisalento.it, joachim.matzinger@oeaw.ac.at, thomas.christiansen@unisalento.it

References

- Angelini P. 2011, *L'influenza del diritto criminale bizantino nel Codice di Dušan. 1349-1354.*, in “Βυζαντινα Συμμεικτα” 21, pp. 217-253.
- Angelini P. 2012, *The Code of Dušan 1349-1354*, in “Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis” 80, pp. 77-93.
- Angelini P. 2014, *Il Codice di Dušan 1349-1354 legislazione greco-romana e amministrazione dell'impero serbo-bizantino*, Aracne, Roma.
- Angelini P. 2015, *The reception of Byzantine Law among the Slav populations: A comparative perspective*, in Δεληκαρη Α. (ed.), *Κυρίλλος και Μεθοδιος: το Βυζαντιο και ο Κοσμος των Σλαβων. Θεσσαλονικη, Δημοσ Θεσσαλονικης*, pp. 453-463.
- Barsalou L.W. 1992, *Frames, concepts, and conceptual fields*, in Kittay E. and Lehrer A. (eds.), *Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organization*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale NJ, pp. 21-74.
- Begović M. 1975, *Zakonik cara Stefana Dušana. Knjiga I: Struški i atonski rukopis*, Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti, Beograd.
- Burr M. 1949-50, *The Code of Stephan Dušan tsar and autocrat of the Serbs and Greeks*, in “The Slavonic (and East European) Review” 28, pp. 198-217; pp. 516-539.
- Çabej E. 1987, *Studime etimologjike në fushë të shqipës. Bleu III: C-D*, Akademia e Shkencave e RPS të Shqipërisë, Tiranë.
- Christiansen T. 2013: *Metaphors as instruments of cultural mediation. Uses of the term «blood» in Edith Durham's works about Northern Albania*, in Genesin M. and Rizzo L. (eds.), *Magic, Tarantismus und Vampirismus. Eine interdisziplinäre Annäherung*, Verlag Dr. Kovač, Hamburg, pp. 159-174.
- Christiansen T., M. Genesin and J. Matzinger 2015, *Metaphors and metonymy regarding body parts in the Kanuni i Lekë Dukagjinit and in Old Geg documents. A preliminary study*, in Demiraj B. (ed.), *Akten der 5. Deutsch-albanischen kulturwissenschaftlichen Tagung*, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, pp. 309-343.
- Daničić Đ. 1863a, *Rječnik iz književnih starina srpskih. Dio prvi*, U Državnoj Štampariji, Beograd.
- Daničić Đ. 1863b, *Rječnik iz književnih starina srpskih. Dio drugi*, U Državnoj Štampariji, Beograd.
- Daničić Đ. 1864, *Rječnik iz književnih starina srpskih. Dio treći*, U Državnoj Štampariji, Beograd.
- Fine J., Van Antwerp J. 1994, *The Late Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Conquest*, University of Michigan Press, Chicago.
- Gibbs R.W. (ed.) 2008, *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Goosens L. 1990, *Metaphtonymy: the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions of linguistic action*, in “Cognitive Linguistics” 1, pp. 323-340.
- Grimm J. and Grimm W. 1984, *Deutsches Wörterbuch 10 (Fotomechanischer Nachdruck der Erstaussgabe Leipzig 1877)*, dtv, München.
- Gurga G. 2009, *At Francesco Maria da Lecce o.f.m. Dittionario Italiano-Albanese (1702). Botim kritik me hyrje dhe fjalësim shqip*, Botime Françeskane, Shkodër.
- Jakobson R. 1956, *Part II: Two aspects of language and two types of aphasic disturbances*, in Jakobson R. and Halle M. (eds.), *Fundamentals of Language*, Mouton, The Hague, pp. 67-96.
- Jung Ahn H. and Y. Jin Kwon 2007, *A study on metaphor and metonymy of hand*, in “Journal of Language Sciences” 14 [2], pp.195-215.
- Karadžić V.S. 1935, *Srpski Rječnik istumačen njemačkim i latinskijem riječima. Četvrto državno izdanje*, U Štampariji Kraljevine Jugoslavije, Beograd.
- Koneski K. 2011, *Tolkoven rečnik na makedonskiot jazik 5. R-S*, Institut za Makedonski Jazik “Krst Misirkov”, Skopje.
- Kövecses Z. 2010, *Metaphor. A Pratical Introduction*, 2nd edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Kövecses Z. and P. Szabó 1996, *Idioms: a view for cognitive semantics*, in “Applied Linguistics” 17, pp. 326-355.
- Lakoff G. and M. Johnson 1980, *Metaphors We Live by*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, London.
- Lakoff G. and M. Johnson 1999, *Philosophy in the Flesh: the Embodied Mind & its Challenge to Western Thought*, Basic Books, New York.
- Lakoff G. and R. Núñez 2000, *Where Mathematics Comes from: How the Embodied Mind Brings Mathematics into Being*, Basic Books, New York.
- Levin E. 1989, *Sex and Society in the World of the Orthodox Slavs 900-1700*, Cornell University Press, Ithaka.
- Maalej Z.A. and Yu N. 2011, *Introduction: embodiment via body parts*, in Maalej Z.A. and Yu N. (eds.), *Embodiment via Body Parts. Studies from Various Languages and Cultures*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 1-20.

- Marković B. 1999, "Krv", in Ćirković S. and Mihaljić R. (eds.), *Leksikon srpskog srednjeg veka*, Knowledge, Beograd, p. 325.
- Marmaridou S. 2011, *The relevance of embodiment to lexical and collocational meaning. The case of prosopo 'face' in Modern Greek*, in Maalej Z.A. and Yu N. (eds.), *Embodiment via Body Parts. Studies from Various Languages and Cultures*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 23-40.
- Mihaljić R. 1999, "Vražda", in Ćirković S. and Mihaljić R. (eds.): *Leksikon srpskog srednjeg veka*, Knowledge, Beograd, pp. 106-107.
- Miklosich F. 1888, *Die Blutrache bei den Slawen*, in "Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse" 36, pp. 127-210.
- Novaković S. 1898, *Zakonik Stefana Dušana cara srpskog 1349 i 1354*, U Državnoj Štampariji, Beograd.
- Novaković S. 1912, *Zakonski spomenici srpskih država srednjega veka*, U Državnoj Štampariji Kraljevine Srbije, Beograd.
- Panther K.U. and Radden G. 1999, *Introduction*, in Panther K.U. and Radden G. (eds.), *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 1-59.
- Patlagean E. 1984, *Byzance et le blason pénal du corps*, in *Du châiment dans la cité. Supplices corporels et peine de mort dans le monde antique. Table ronde de Rome (9-11 novembre 1982)*, École Française de Rome, Rome, pp. 405-427.
- Peña Cervel S. 2001, *A cognitive approach to the role of body parts in the conceptualization of emotions metaphors*, in "Epos" 17, pp. 245-60.
- Pușcariu S. 1905, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der rumänischen Sprache. 1. Lateinisches Element mit Berücksichtigung aller romanischen Sprachen*, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, Heidelberg.
- Racheva M. and T. Todorov 2002, *Български етимологичен речник 6: Пускам-Slovàr*, Akademično Izdatelstvo "Prof. Marin Drinov", Sofija.
- Radden G. and Z. Kövecses 1999, *Towards a theory of metonymy*, in Panther K.-U. and Radden G. (eds.), *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 17-59.
- Radojčić N. 1960, *Zakonik cara Stefana Dušana 1349 i 1354*. Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti, Beograd.
- Ressuli N. 1958, *Il "Messale" di Giovanni Buzuku. Riproduzione e trascrizione*, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano.
- Salvioni C. 1891, *Il 'Sermone' di Pietro da Barsegapé*, in "Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie" 15, pp. 429-492.
- Šarkić S. 1999, "Ruka", in Ćirković S. and Mihaljić R. (eds.), *Leksikon srpskog srednjeg veka*, Knowledge Beograd, p. 634.
- Šarkić S. 2010, *Über die Bedeutung des Wortes ruka (Hand) im serbischen mittelalterlichen Recht*, in "The Annals of the Faculty of Law in Belgrade" 58 [3], pp.203-208.
- Schmitt O. 2002, *Un monumento dell'Albania medievale: gli statuti di Scutari*, in Nadin L. (ed.), *Statuti di Scutari della prima metà del secolo XIV con le addizioni fino al 1469*, Viella, Roma, pp. 25-45.
- Silaški N. and Radić-Bojanić B. 2014, *Metonymy in expressions pertaining to hand/ruka in English and Serbian*, in Đergović-Joksimović Z. and Halupka-Rešetar S. (eds.), *English Studies Today: Prospects and Perspectives. Selected Papers from the Second Conference "English Language and Anglophone Literatures Today"*, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of English Studies, Novi Sad, pp. 29-37.
- Skok P. 1973, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika 3 (poni-Ž)*, Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti, Zagreb.
- Solovjev [Soloviev] A.V. 1959, *Der Einfluß des Byzantinischen Rechts auf die Völker Osteuropas*, in "Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Romanistische Abteilung" 76, pp. 432-479.
- Solovjev [Soloviev] A.V. 1980, *Zakonik cara Stefana Dušana 1349. i 1354. godine*, Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti, Beograd.
- Svane G. 1986, *Pjetër Budi. Rituale Romanum (1621). With a Transcription into Modern Orthography and a Concordance*, Aarhus University Press, Aarhus.
- Taranovski T. 1935, *Istorija srpskog prava u nemanjićkog državi. 3. Deo: Istorija građanskog prava /4. Deo: Istorija sudskog uređenja i postupka*, Izdavačko i knjižarsko preduzeće Geca Kon, Beograd.
- Wartburg von W. 1969, *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch 6, 1 (Mabille-mephitis)*, Zbinden, Basel.
- Weber R. and Gryson R. (eds.) 1994, *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart.
- Yu N. 2003, *The bodily dimension of meaning in Chinese: what do we do and mean with hands*, in Casad E. M. and Palmer G.B. (eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics and non-Indoeuropean Languages*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 337-362.
- Yu N. 2001, *What does our face mean to us?*, in "Pragmatics and Cognition" 9, pp. 1-36.
- Yu N. 2004, *The eyes for sight and mind*, in "Journal of Pragmatics" 36, pp. 663-686.

- Yu N. 2008, *Metaphor from body and culture*, in Gibbs R. W. (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 247-61.
- Ziemke T. and Frank R.M. 2007, *Introduction: The body eclectic*, in Ziemke T., Zlatev J. and Frank R.M. (eds.), in *Body, Language and Mind. Vol. 1: Embodiment* (Cognitive Linguistic Research 31.1), Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, pp.1-13.